UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,503	03/10/2006	Jean-Yves Bitterlich	03869.105774	4152

86528   7590   11/21/2011
King & Spalding LLP
401 Congress Avenue
Suite 3200
Austin, TX 78701

EXAMINER
PHANTANA ANGKOOL, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/21/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

AustinUSPTO@kslaw.com
AustinIP@kslaw.com

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*19 August 2011*</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

5) ☒ Claim(s) <u>*4-12*</u> is/are pending in the application.

    5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7) ☒ Claim(s) <u>*4-12*</u> is/are rejected.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to Applicant's Remarks filed on August 19th, 2011.

        This action is made Final.

2.   Claims 4-12, 14, 16, and 18 are pending in the case. Claims 4, 7, and 10 are independent

        claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness**

rejections set forth in this Office action:

        (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
        set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
        patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious
        at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said
        subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention
        was made.

4.   **Claims 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious by Saka, US# 7,519,910**

(hereinafter Saka) in view of Maddalozzo, Jr. et al, US# 6,445,400 B1 (hereinafter Maddalozzo).

As for independent claim 4:

Saka shows a method for generating an object processing platform between an object computer and a

processing computer, wherein the object computer is configure to generate a local object computer

graphical user interface (GUI) displayed by the object computer, wherein the processing computer is

configured to generate a local processing computer GUI displayed by the processing computer, and

wherein an ad hoc screen assembly is performed by the object computer with the processing computer to

couple a respective input and/or output device, the method comprising of:

- *the object computer* (local machine, see Figure 12)*; initiating a generation of an assembled*

    display (Figure 12, see assembled display in 7: 38-40) *combining at least a portion of a display*

    belonging to the object computer and at least a portion of a display belonging to the processing

compute (remote machine, see Figure 12 and Saka in Figure 12 and column 7, lines 15-20 show

a user interface displaying a portion of a display of a local machine desktop and a remote

machine desktop), *wherein as a result of generating the assembled display, at least a portion of*

the local object computer GUI displayed by the object computer at the time of generating the

assembled display is displayed on the display belonging to the processing computer (see Figure

12, where Saka shows the assembled display of object and processing computer). (Saka shows

the user copying files from a remote machine desktop to local machine desktop by moving the

respective icons form remote machine desktop to local machine desktop in column 7, lines 42-47.

Figure 12 shows a portion of both local and remote machine desktops at the same time. Saka

shows that file #183 icon (Figure 12# 1066) and pdf file Figure 12# 1068 maybe copied from

remote machine desktop to local machine desktop. Saka shows the desktop of the object

computer (local) is displayed on the processing computer (remote).

- *in response to a user moving an object from the portion of the assembled display belonging to the*

  object computer to an interaction area of the portion of the assembled display belonging to the

  processing computer (Figure 12 shows the interaction area where the user can copy a file from

  one computer to another by selecting the desired file or icon, see 7:15-20 and 7: 37-42).

- *activating a local file processing function by means of a local coupling of the object to the*

  interaction area (7:37-42)*;*

While Saka shows a*ssembled display combining at least a portion of a display belonging to the*

object computer and at least a portion of a display belonging to the processing computer, Sake does not

specifically show *automatically causing the display belonging to the processing computer to switch from*

displaying the at least portion of the local object computer GUI to displaying the local processing

computer GUI automatically generating an object processing platform. In the same field of endeavor,

Maddalozzo teaches in *automatically causing the display belonging to the processing computer to switch*

from displaying the at least portion of the local object computer GUI to displaying the local processing

computer GUI automatically generating an object processing platform in 5:1-17, 5:17-25, and 5:32-43. In

the cited section, Maddalozzo teaches highlighting of windows based on user selection. The windows are

highlighted based on a selection performed by the user with respect to the variable parameters. Both

Saka and Maddalozzo teach a user interface displaying a plurality of windows. This automatic

highlighting of Maddalozzo teaches the switching aspect of the claims. Accordingly it would have been

obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Saka to

incorporate the teaching of highlighting window border based on user input as taught by Maddalozzo,

thus allowing the system to easily place focus on multiple windows displayed on a desktop (Maddalozzo,

5:32-45)

As for dependent claim 5:

Saka shows *the method according to claim 4, further, comprising an application-specific processing of the*

object is started by a further coupling of the object to an application icon on the display belonging to the

processing computer (7: 37-47)

As for dependent claim 6:

Saka shows *the method according to claim 5, wherein object-computer-specific data of the object is*

converted into application-specific data (7:37-47 and 7:53-64)

As for independent claim 7:

Claim 7 contains similar substantial subject matter as claimed in independent claim 4, and is respectfully

rejected along the same rationale.

As for dependent claims 8 and 9:

Claims 8 and 9 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, and are

respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As for independent claim 10:

Claim 10 contains similar substantial subject matter as claimed in independent claim 4, and is respectfully

rejected along the same rationale.

As for dependent claims 11 and 12:

Claims 11 and 12 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, and are

respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicants argue *the proposed combination of Saka in view of Maddalozzo fails to teach a key feature of Applicant's claimed invention -- namely, the causal relationship between moving the object to the interaction area and switching the display from displaying at least a portion of the local object computer GUI to displaying the GUI of the processing computer* (Applicants' remarks, Pg. 6). The Office respectfully disagrees.

6.   The limitations argued by the Applicants above are broad, specifically the integration area. Nowhere in the claim specify what the interaction area is. As currently claimed, the Office interprets the user interface shown in Figure 12 as the integration area. According to Applicant's Specification the integration area are displayed as a bar at the top of each screen (see Applicant's drawing, Figure 7). With the rationale presented above the combined of teachings of Saka and Maddalozzo teach and suggest all the limitations in claim 1 along with independent claims 7 and 10.

7.   Applicants argue the Examiner has not provided a sufficient rationale for modifying Saka based on Maddalozzo. The Office respectfully disagrees.

8.   As shown in the Office action above, Saka shows a user interface with an interaction area containing a plurality of windows and Maddalozzo teaches highlighting of windows based on user selection. Maddalozzo's windows are highlighted based on a selection performed by the user with respect to the variable parameters. Both Saka and Maddalozzo teach a user interface displaying a plurality of windows. This automatic highlighting of Maddalozzo teaches the switching aspect of the claims. Accordingly it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Saka to incorporate the teaching of highlighting window border based on user input as taught by Maddalozzo, thus allowing the system to easily place focus on multiple windows displayed on a desktop (Maddalozzo, 5:32-45).

Conclusion

9.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Phantana-angkool whose telephone number is 571-272-2673. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30 PM.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application
Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from
either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through
Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)
at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative
or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-
1000.

DP
/David Phantana-angkool/
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/William Bashore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175